



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 1967

---

## Mobilization system (and latin american upper stratum) societies

Heintz, Peter

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-206778>

Journal Article

Published Version

Originally published at:

Heintz, Peter (1967). Mobilization system (and latin american upper stratum) societies. Bulletin - Soziologisches Institut der Universität Zürich:1-11.

List of Mobilization Systems

## MOBILIZATION SYSTEM (AND LATIN AMERICAN UPPER STRATUM) SOCIETIES

---

This category includes the following

countries:

Cuba (Castro's revolution has been taken into account)

Costa Rica (The original MS system has recently changed through democratic means)

### 1. Theory

The mobilization system societies use by definition a societal-political approach to the solution of the development problem. We assume that their policies are determined by T (structural tensions) without interference of external or internal factors, i.e. without disturbances caused by resistance to the application of such policies.

This means that the mobilization system societies (MS) put a maximum emphasis on the value of development. Such an emphasis implies the lack of relevance of cultural differences within the society (cultural homogeneity) and in terms of the social context a maximum level of urbanization (U). It also implies an emphasis on interest articulation by vertically oriented institutional groups which appear as a consequence of the differential accessibility of societal status (especially E versus I) and a lack of interest articulation by association-al groups and finally the absence of ascription of power.

However, the policy of mobilization system societies requires a relatively strong external autonomy, for example in the field of external economic interaction. This may imply another value, the value of independence.

## 2. List of Mobilization System Societies

Our initial analysis is based on a list of countries which according to current information can easily be assigned to this category of societies. This list includes the following countries:

Cuba (Castros' independence from the Communist countries is taken into account)

Costa Rica (The original MS regime has recently changed through democratic means)

Mexico

Turkey

Algeria

Tunisia

Egypt

Bolivia } (Recent military coups by Ankrah and Barrientos  
Ghana } brought about a change. They can no more be con-  
sidered as MS)

This list will be revised after obtaining the first results based on them.

Since the mobilization system societies supposedly express through their policy the existence of structural tensions of the T type, we shall present in the following a list of the T values and also of the T-components E-I and U-I.

We hypothesize that these countries should show a clear positive relationship between T and I. Finally, we shall add the Trade/GNP values taken from Bruce Russett as an indicator of external economic dependency.

The list of societies for which these values are presented includes some countries which are not identified in our first approach as mobilization system societies but which

enter into the hypothesized relationships between T and I. We also include US since this country may be conceived as a major leader of development in the sense of a positive reference group.

Country	I	E-I	U-I	T	Trade/GNP	Rank
					%	
US	100	-0.5	-22.3	-22.8	7	14
Israel	28.2	66.9	62.8	129.7	27	9
Argentina	19.0	68.7	50.3	119.0	25	10
Cuba	16.7	62.0	37.9	99.9	60	2
Chile	14.7	66.6	54.5	121.1	22	11
Costa Rica	13.9	66.7	9.1	75.8	42	5
Mexico	10.2	40.6	25.7	66.6	18	12
Turkey	8.5	31.1	18.7	43.8	14	13
Algeria	6.9	12.4	14.2	26.6	-	-
Syria	6.7	21.2	51.3	72.5	41	6
Tunisia	6.7	11.1	23.0	34.1	48	3
Ghana	6.7	16.2	2.9	19.1	44	4
Egypt	5.5	14.7	38.0	52.7	38	7
Bolivia	3.8	28.8	25.2	54.0	66	1
Cambodia	3.8	14.0	20.1	34.1	28	8

If we order these countries according to their Trade/GNP values, we obtain the following list:

Country	Trade/GNP Rank
Bolivia	1
Cuba	2
Tunisia	3
Ghana	4
Costa Rica	5
Syria	6
Egypt	7



	<u>Trade/GNP Rank</u>
Cambodia	8
Israel	9
Argentina	10
Chile	11
Mexico	12
Turkey	13
US	14

As can be seen from this list there seems to be a certain relationship between the degree of outspoken anti-US politics or recent radical change of regime (= abandonment of MS) and degree of external economic dependency. Tunisia does not fit at all into this relationship.

### 3. Location of the Mobilization System Societies (MS) between the Modern Industrial Societies (MIG) and Traditional Feudal Societies (TFG)

If we use pairs of variables which are relevant for the description and explanation of development, we can observe that with respect to some of them the pattern formed by the mobilization system societies clearly separates the two main other groups of societies, i.e. the modern industrial and traditional feudal societies. This can be interpreted in terms of a position of the mobilization system societies in between the two other groups. In operational terms this means that the pattern formed by the mobilization system societies cuts across the pattern formed by the two other types of societies in such a way that both groups are clearly separated. This is true for the following pairs of variables used. We also indicate the nature of the relationship between these variables for the non-mobilization system societies. All these relationships point into the expected direction.

I/LF (percentage of working age population  
in agriculture) : -

NOIN (percentage of working age population in the  
tertiary sector) / LF : -

LD (index for labor division between primary,  
secondary and tertiary sector) / I : +

LF / LD : -

TERT (percentage of economic active population in  
the tertiary sector) / I : +

LF / TERT : -

LD / PR (percentage of economic active population  
in primary sector) : -

U / EP : +

IND (percentage of working age population in  
industry) / EP : +

PR / EP : -

U / HS (percentage of enrolment in higher education) : +

LD / HS : +

TERT / HS : +

SC (percentage of economic active population in  
the secondary sector) / HS : +

#### 4. Independence of Variables

Some of the variables used in this analysis are independent when confronted with other variables within the MS-pattern. This independence only refers to one other variable.

Within the frame of the variables used we find the following independent relationships:

independent of	
I	LD (slightly positive)
I	LF (slightly negative)
EP	U
HS	LD
HS	SC

#### 5. Borderline Patterns of Mobilization System Societies

The mobilization system societies generally form clear and tendentially linear patterns. This is especially true when such patterns referring to pairs of variables constitute a borderline for the other types of societies which accordingly are placed on one side of the pattern. In these cases the mobilization system societies pattern does not separate the modern industrial from the traditional feudal societies. The two types have then in common to be located on one side of the pattern. In addition, we can observe that in these particular cases the pattern of the mobilization system societies clearly points into the direction of US and Israel. In other words, if the linear pattern is extended, we find on this extension the above mentioned two countries which coincide with those of which we guess that they may serve as main leaders of development. This also implies that in operational terms the straightest line between low development and US or Israel coincides with the pattern formed by the mobilization system societies.

We shall indicate in the following the differences between the mobilization system societies, on one side, and the modern industrial and traditional feudal societies on the other as presented by the relationships between the pairs of variables which produce a borderline pattern for the mobilization system societies.

Relationships	Differences between modern industrial and traditional feudal societies and mobilization system societies	
IND / U : +	$\begin{array}{l} \text{IND (MIG, TFG)} \geq \\ \text{U (MIG, TFG)} \leq \end{array}$	IND, U (MS)
LF / U : -	$\text{LF, U (MIG, TFG)} < \text{LF, U (MS)}$	
LF / IND : -	$\text{IND, LF (MIG, TFG)} > \text{IND, LF (MS)}$	
IND / LD : +	$\begin{array}{l} \text{IND (MIG, TFG)} \geq \\ \text{LD (MIG, TFG)} \leq \end{array}$	IND, LD (MS)
TERT / IND : +	$\begin{array}{l} \text{TERT (MIG, TFG)} \leq \\ \text{IND (MIG, TFG)} \geq \end{array}$	TERT, IND (MS)
U / SC : +	$\begin{array}{l} \text{U (MIG, TFG)} \leq \\ \text{SC (MIG, TFG)} \geq \end{array}$	U, SC (MS)
LD / SC : +	$\begin{array}{l} \text{LD (MIG, TFG)} \leq \\ \text{SC (MIG, TFG)} \geq \end{array}$	LD, SC (MS)
U / PR : -	$\text{U, PR (MIG, TFG)} < \text{U, PR (MS)}$	
IND / PR : -	$\text{IND, PR (MIG, TFG)} > \text{IND, PR (MS)}$	
U / LD : +	$\begin{array}{l} \text{U (MIG, TFG)} \leq \\ \text{LD (MIG, TFG)} \geq \end{array}$	U, LD (MS)

The most important relationships and differences are the following three:

U / IND, SC	$\begin{array}{l} \text{U (MIG, TFG)} \leq \\ \text{IND (MIG, TFG)} \geq \end{array}$	U, IND (MS)
LD / IND, SC	$\begin{array}{l} \text{LD (MIG, TFG)} \leq \\ \text{IND (MIG, TFG)} \geq \end{array}$	LD, IND (MS)
U / LD : +	$\begin{array}{l} \text{U (MIG, TFG)} \leq \\ \text{LD (MIG, TFG)} \geq \end{array}$	U, LD (MS)



This means that the mobilization system societies and also the development leaders US and Israel consistently show a maximum of U in relationship to the degree of industrialization.

The following matrix summarizes and supplements the findings concerning borderline (0) and intermediate (cross-cutting) (/) patterns:

	LF/PR	IND/SC	TERT/NOIN	LD	EP	U
LF/PR		0	/	/	/	0
IND/SC			0	0	/	0
TERT/NOIN				/*	/**	0*
LD					/**	0
EP						/
U						

\* NOIN/LD

\*\* additional relationship

This matrix can be interpreted in the sense that

- IND/SC and U are dominant determinants of borderline patterns,
- EP is a dominant determinant of intermediate, cross-cutting patterns, and
- LF/PR, TERT/NOIN and LD are non-dominant determinants of intermediate, cross-cutting patterns.

In addition, if we select the variables which are independent of U and IND, we observe that it is the EP or educational potential which has this characteristic. Finally the I variable is the one which is independent of LD.

#### 6. Other Countries within the Borderline Pattern of MS-Societies

Apart from those countries which have not been identified as mobilization system societies but which belong to the T/I pattern like Argentina, Chile and, to a lower extent, Panama and Honduras, we find that the countries which most frequently fall into this pattern are the following:

Country	I	E-I	U-I	T	Trade/GNP
Malaya	13.8	25.2	20.1	45.3	-
Taiwan	6.2	48.6	29.2	78.3	20
Morocco	5.5	7.2	30.7	37.9	33

Taiwan has, together with South Korea which also tends to be near the pattern, relatively high T values in relationship with their I values. The contrary is true for Malaya, as well as for Venezuela which also tends to be located near the pattern. Both countries show relatively low T values with respect to their I values.

#### 7. Differences between US and Israel

As said before, US and Israel tend to be located on the linear extension of the borderline pattern of the mobilization system societies. But, whereas Israel can be considered as a part of the T/I pattern - this is also true for the E-I/I and the U-I/I pattern - US is characterized by very low T, E-I and U-I values.

## 8. Some Interpretative Remarks

The mobilization system and upper stratum Latin American societies tend to be countries with a relatively advanced degree of development probably determined by E. In this respect we may take into account that a certain degree of development generally is a pre-condition for a minimum of power as a requisite for a relatively autonomous policy (independence). Furthermore, we may consider the fact that on the world level, as well as in other systems, we find as an empirical regularity a negative association between rank tension and disequilibrium tension within the lower half of the system. This means that a process of transformation of one kind of tension into another represents a rather time consuming process.

It seems to be in accordance with the concept of mobilization system society that the E variable moves with certain independence of variables more closely linked to the internal structure.

In addition, we may interpret the relatively low emphasis on industrialization with respect to urbanization and labour division as an effect of a policy which is geared towards the maintenance of a relatively high degree of national independence. A relatively high value on the LD-index may indeed indicate that the industrialization process is not conceived by these countries as the leader of development, i.e. as relatively independent of other development aspects. This would imply that the model of development of these countries is not the classical capitalist one in which the main dynamic force is supposed to be industrial entrepreneurship.

It is most striking that the borderline patterns represent the straightest line between low degrees of development and US (and Israel). This seems to suggest an orientation of the

mobilization system policy towards US in the sense of a positive reference group. In this respect it seems to be necessary to consider not only the economic-social relationships implied but also and may be even more so the political requisite of such a policy, i.e. the relative independence achieved through a concentration of resources and modern culture in the urban areas. This would be in accordance with the fact already mentioned of a certain relationship between an anti-US policy or break-down of the MS-regime and external economic dependency. The relatively low T value of US in comparative terms may be interpreted as a discriminatory relationship between US and these countries.